

**DRAFT**  
**Meeting Summary**  
**Western Governors' Wildlife Council**  
**March 26 – 27, 2009**  
**Denver, Colorado**

<b>Summary of WGWC Meeting Outcomes</b>
<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Consider a fall 2009 public event to identify a common framework for a DSS in each state that allows for coordination across state line, to review assessments of current systems and to coordinate with federal and other partners.</li><li>2. WGA will communicate to the WREZ Environment &amp; Lands Work Group that the Council maintains their current definition of “avoid” for purposes wildlife protections in renewable energy zones. The Council did modify the definition of “high sensitive” to address the potential for mitigation to reduce wildlife impacts in those areas.</li><li>3. WGA staff will develop a description, charge and timeline for the DSS Subgroup and the Corridors &amp; Connectivity Subgroup for Council members to review and for consideration of appropriate staff.</li><li>4. WGA staff will circulate a proposal previously prepared for the Senate Energy Committee on state needs for developing coordinated DSSs.</li><li>5. Using the proposal mentioned above, WGA staff will draft a proposal for WGA Staff Council and the Secretaries of Energy, Agriculture and the Interior, highlighting state needs in establishing their DSSs, for Council members to review.</li><li>6. WGA will circulate a list of web links to pending wildlife legislation in the Congress.</li><li>7. WGA will circulate meeting minutes to Council for review and future public posting, and will circulate meeting presentations.</li><li>8. Next Meeting: WGA will work with John Emmerich and WAFWA to schedule time during WAFWA’s summer meeting in Newport Beach, CA, July 10 – 16.</li></ol>



The Western Governors' Wildlife Council met over a two-day period in Denver, Colorado for purposes of making progress on its work plan that was adopted at its January 2009 meeting in San Francisco, California. This document tracks the agenda from the Denver meeting and summarizes key discussions that took place and outcomes upon which the Council agreed.

**Meeting Objectives:**

- Review and discuss criteria for a successful Decision Support System;
- Review existing actions by individual states regarding development of a state DSS;
- Review use of wildlife information in the Western Renewable Energy Zones project, and draw from the project regarding development of state DSSs and information management;

- Establish subcommittees (Science Committee and a DSS Task Group) to discuss needs and tasks, for subsequent WGWC review, related to scientific advice and a DSS creation and implementation process;
- Identify specific actions for 2009 consistent with the WGWC work plan; and,
- Identify federal and foundation partnerships and funding opportunities for states and the WGWC.

### **Agenda Item: Decision Support Systems, Requirements and Existing Models**

Each Council member outlined their states efforts to develop Decision Support Systems.

T.O. Smith – Montana:

The state is working to refine a comprehensive strategy and definitions of key terms. The DSS will be GIS-based and launched on the Internet for the public to use and search by species. It will not be a regulatory system, but will include some voluntary guidelines. The state is seeking a color code mapping of sensitivity. Currently state biologists are being overwhelmed by the amount of development. They may develop some standard set of recommendations for use of the DSS with regards to transportation, energy, residential development, and other land uses.

John Emmerich – Wyoming:

Wyoming has maintained an operational DSS for about four years. It was developed by interviewing all Wyoming Game and Fish field people to see how they would use this tool with a goal of having all resources in one GIS system built by the University of Wyoming. Recently finished the sage-brush ecosystem map. All resources and political boundaries are included for state to review project proposals. The system requires one stand-alone server, licenses for users. The state is using it to review proposals as an internal system. There is no regulation or executive order associated with it, although stipulations can be required for activities on state lands.

Holly Michael – Oregon:

Much like Montana, Oregon is developing a publicly available, voluntary system that allows the user to call up layers on Google map. The state is ready to post shape files soon and it will include wildlife corridors data as well.

Tom Remington – Colorado:

HB 1298 from the 2007 legislature called for integrating oil and gas permitting decisions with wildlife protections. As of this meeting, the Colorado legislature has approved the publically available regulatory system. The system provides mandatory restricted surface occupancy and mandatory consultation for some species before oil and gas activities will be permitted. Critical habitats are buffered and the public can manipulate, enter coordinates of proposed activities and understand the regulatory requirements. The public does not have access to GIS shape files.

John Mankowski – Washington:

Goal of the state DSS is to develop good data and then get it in people's hands. The state has good point data on species locations. Then it evolved into crucial habitat mapping

phase. The state now has a habitat connectivity process underway, for planning transportation project. Four state statutes govern the use of the data: Growth Management Act, Shoreline Management Act, Forest Practices Act and State NEPA. The data is also used for non-regulatory reasons like purchasing conservation easements, purchasing development rights, and Section 6 money. The Washington Biodiversity Council established by executive order also makes non-regulatory use of the data. The system also allows volunteers like students and retirees to submit data and there is a process to assure the quality of this information before it is added to the state DSS. Still need work on habitat connectivity that crosses state boundaries and developing common definitions and objectives with neighbors to be able to best manage these areas. The state also wants the federal agencies to make better use of the state system.

J.D. Strong – Oklahoma:

The state has developed a non-regulatory planning tool for the 95% of its land that is held in private. At this point the system is mainly used to inform the siting of wind developments in order to best manage the Lesser Prairie Chicken and other short-grass prairie species. The state looks to utility companies to provide mitigation costs to the Division of Wildlife that are used to conserve key LPC habitats and corridors.

Bob Broscheid – Arizona:

The state has developed a non-regulatory DSS that is maintained by a contractor in response to population growth in the state. The state seeks to get planner to use this information up front at the state, local, federal and international level (Mexico). The state does have a Growing Smarter Act that says “May or should” consider. A scorecard or self-assessment tool has been created for wildlife and incentive money has been tied to high scores on the assessment to NGOs to provide data. The DSS includes 302 distribution models for species that is compiled into a richness index. Some key uses include invasive species monitoring and climate change impacts to help prioritize and direct state resources. The DSS is also used to assist in development of mitigation strategies.

Bruce Thompson – New Mexico:

The state has elements of what’s been mentioned so far but it does not have a DSS. Driven by the WGA Corridors Initiative, the State legislature recently passed a joint memorial calling upon the Energy and Minerals Department to advance the state’s work on crucial habitat and wildlife corridors. That State Legislature also approved a joint memorial that calls for a broad GIS information-sharing endeavor in state to support something like a DSS. The state is looking at some type of overarching effort to encourage greater information connectivity. The public needs to know what to do with information once it is available and it should also be interpretable across states.

John Harja –Utah:

The State maintains a non-regulatory system that allows a process to get good information to the parties. Information is provided to the federal agencies but its use by them could be improved. Key use is for inter-agency use in the state between agencies that might not otherwise be able to communicate effectively. Much of the system is used

to help ensure candidate species do not become listed. Ensuring the correct information and that state agencies consult it before making decisions are the goals for the Utah DSS.

The Council then engaged in a conversation of commonalities between current DSSs and what is needed to move the systems to be able to coordinate and communicate across state boundaries.

- all are GIS arc based
- coordination in the region is helped by federal participation and acceptability by the public but at the same time, we do not want to hamper states ability to function independently.
- coordination between systems could assist traditional and renewable energy developers for example that want to do work in many states and could understand and address species impacts more efficiently if states maintained coordinated information
- all states are seeking financial support to improve their systems and we may be able to do this collectively, but each system will need to end up looking and applying very differently than each others.

The Council reviewed the eight recommendations from the Science Committee regarding creation of a DSS from the June 2008 Wildlife Corridors report adopted by the Western Governors.

- 1) Create an integrated fish and wildlife Decision Support System (DSS).
- 2) The Governors should support need-based prioritized systematic surveys for wildlife species, their habitat and connectivity.
- 3) The Council should include climate change as a central part of its program.
- 4) The Governors should consider directing their appropriate State agencies to create prioritized corridor maps for the entire state as part of each iteration of their SWAPs.
- 5) To improve state capacity for detailed corridor design, the Governors should consider funding for state personnel, such as a spatial ecologist, to coordinate the state's effort to develop detailed corridor conservation plans for the top priority corridors.
- 6) The Western Governors should consider requiring comprehensive availability of all non-confidential or non-protected data held or acquired by or through a state agency.
- 7) The Governors should seek funding for sufficient staff to provide advice to federal, state, and local agencies on such issues as building highways and canal, approving energy and mining projects, managing public land, and making land-use decisions that affect wildlife corridors.
- 8) Governors should consider establishing goals and policies that will result in all development proposals considering using the data, models and analyses from the DSS developed by each state to assess impacts to crucial habitat or wildlife corridors. Avoidance, minimization, and mitigation of such impacts, in sequence, should be the goal.

There was agreement that seeking federal and private funding to improve each state's system, to coordinate systems between states and to develop consistent corridor maps

was a priority. States agreed that any effort to enhance state data for a DSS should be connected to their Comprehensive Wildlife Conservation Strategies.

There was also discussion regarding each state's view of how to make climate change and adaptation a central part of the Council's program as the Governors requested. Some states are further along than others in seeking and integrating adaptation science into their individual state systems. However, the Council was agreeable to seeking resources generally to better understand how to develop and use climate change and adaptation science in the Council's and individual state's efforts.

There was discussion of having a summit, conference or symposium to flesh out and reach consensus on a number of different issues. Suggested features of such an event included sharing of DSS objectives and capabilities between state technical leads and policy leads, beginning a discussion about cross-jurisdictional issues and corridors, and developing a common framework for a DSS in each state. Apart from this framework it is clear that each state will have to customize their DSS based on their own data issues and policies. Self-assessments of existing DSSs could be used to identify immediate next steps for each state as well as assist in developing a common framework. As was illustrated earlier in the meeting, each state is in a different spot along the path to developing their DSS. Assessments could also be done by a contractor.

Modeling corridors and climate change impacts was proffered as another topic at the symposium. And it was also suggested that part of the agenda should include federal agencies for coordination and funding purposes. Nongovernmental groups were also suggested attendees. It was proposed that the fall of 2009 could be a good time to hold such an event.

Council members discussed transparency and using non-state data. Transparency and involving the public in collecting data is critical in some states and less important in others. It was agreed that transparency as a principle needs to be closely considered by each state.

#### Elements of a DSS

It was offered that resources received by states to develop DSSs should be tied to each state's Comprehensive Wildlife Conservation Strategy or Wildlife Action Plans and that there should be a goal to ensure that data matches across jurisdictions, and data definitions should be consistent across state boundaries. Overarching standards for a DSS were also suggested with a strong connection to SWAPs so that the DSS supports and helps to drive implementation of the SWAP.

Finally, the quality and quantity of data that states are currently relying on was discussed. Some felt that they could not wait for perfect data and had to move ahead with a DSS while identifying gaps and needs for the future. Others suggested data quality was a current issue and resources for the on-the-ground staff and equipment were necessary on the front end.

## **Public Comment – Day 1**

Public comment from outside attendees was taken during the discussion of DSSs.

### **Agenda Item: Western Renewable Energy Zones Initiative (WREZ)**

Rich Halvey, Energy Program Manager for WGA gave background on transmission issues, potential federal transmission legislation that would incorporate WGA's REZs and the request of the Secretaries of the Interior, Agriculture and Energy to meet with the governors to better coordinate transmission development efforts. Rich also discussed with the Council the need for clarification of the "avoid" and "high sensitive" definitions previously established by the Council for use by the Environment and Lands workgroup of the WREZ. The main issue was whether "avoid" means some level of renewable energy development was possible on lands labeled as such or whether no development was possible.

Possible topics for WGA to raise and seek agreement with the three Secretaries include:

- the need to evaluate and mitigate impacts to wildlife from renewable energy transmission projects
- review 368 corridor designations in conjunction with new REZ designations
- transmission needs in the western interconnect
- "right sizing" transmission wires so they are big enough to account for demand
- coordinated permitting of transmission lines that cross different land ownerships
- lowering of solar and wind transmission costs

The Council's suggestion for what to seek from a Governors' meeting with the three Secretaries was to be taken up the next day.

As to the WREZ definitions, the Council could decide to strengthen the definition of avoid as meaning no possibility for development in that area. If so, WREZ Environment & Lands and the Technical Committee of the WREZ would need to consider whether it was appropriate to put some level of development potential in the avoid areas or not. After discussion, the Council decided to maintain their current definition of avoid with the reminder that "Core Premise (a)" helped to clarify that some level of development could possibly occur in "avoid" areas because there is no legal mechanism to clearly preclude it. A modification to add language regarding the potential for mitigation to reduce wildlife impacts in the "high sensitive" definition was agreed to by the Council.

The WREZ discussion included, via webinar, a review of the maps prepared by NatureServe on each state's wildlife data as applied to the Qualified Resource Areas of the WREZ project. Patrick Crist and Lynn Kutner of NatureServe participated on the telephone.

For the WREZ discussion, the Council was also joined, by telephone, by E&L members Carl Zichella of the Sierra Club, Brian Weber of Mid-American Energy Holdings and Shay LaBray of Pacific Corp.

## DAY TWO

### **Agenda Item: Consideration of Subcommittees (Science Committee and DSS Task Group)**

The Council initially discussed further the concept of a symposium or summit to share information among multiple states, and with the federal government and outside stakeholders, on corridor mapping, matching corridors across states, reaching common definitions for wildlife data, and other cross-jurisdictional issues. Some of the basis for such an event will be developed any sub-groups formed by the Council over the next several months.

#### *The DSS Subgroup*

The Council discussed forming a group of policy and technical staff to focus specifically on how DSS programs work currently especially in regard to SWAPs, what is needed to further these efforts and what is needed to support coordination across state boundaries. A self-assessment by each state of their DSS would be requested as a starting point for discussions. A “scorecard” illustrating each state’s success in identifying and conserving corridors and crucial habitats was also suggested for consideration by this Subgroup.

The “DSS Subgroup” would seek to convene in person and/or by phone to develop a workplan proposal for the Council by their next meeting likely in July 2009. The DSS Subgroup should also propose how to integrate federal, county, tribal and non-governmental stakeholder partners and their data into the subgroup efforts and any conference or event that it suggests. The subgroup should also consider working with the National State GIS Coordination Council (NSGCC) suggested by ESRI. WGA will host a conference call with DSS Subgroup designees as soon as they are designated by Council members.

#### *Wildlife Corridors & Connectivity Subgroup*

The Council also agreed to form a Corridors & Connectivity Subgroup that would seek to develop common understandings, definitions and mapping/modeling protocols on these topics while promoting site-level coordination. Coordination with SWAPs should also be a topic for this subgroup. The information developed would then be shared within states, and with federal agencies like the Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration. As the charge of this subgroup is being developed, the Council agreed to consider whether it should remain separate from the DSS Subgroup or at some point be combined with it. Again, state self-assessments of the status of their efforts in this regard should potentially be a basis for the work of the subgroup and a conference or event should be considered to bring partners into this effort.

#### *Status of the WREZ State Task Group*

It was agreed to keep the STG on “unactive duty” and reactivate them as the Council moves forward to implement its work plan, specifically inputting information into the transmission planning phases of the WREZ. At that time, it would be up to individual Council members to reactivate their original STG member or appoint another appropriate individual to staff the group.

### Proposal to the Three Secretaries

The Council agreed to work as a whole through the Chair and Vice Chair to develop a proposal for the federal government that could be delivered at the WGA Annual Meeting June 14-16 in Park City, Utah or potentially sooner. The Secretaries of Energy, Agriculture and the Interior may meet with the Governors in Park City to discuss and seek agreements on policy issues related to transmission planning for renewable energy production in the West. The basis for the proposal would be a document developed by WGA staff and submitted to the Senate Energy Committee by Joanna Prukop of New Mexico seeking funding for development of state DSSs while enhancing the ability of states to coordinate this data across state lines and with federal agencies. The proposal would be a high level document focusing on the need for states to identifying a model for a DSS, and then assess specific technical, cooperative and implementation needs for each state. This document can be used for the purposes of a Governors' event with the Secretaries, while financial and other specific details would need to be developed by all Council members shortly thereafter.

### **Agenda Item: Opportunities and Interested Parties**

#### Monique DiGiorgio, Western Environmental Law Center

Monique spoke to the need for corridors and connectivity data to work across state boundaries and that the Council should play a role in coordinating this data to ensure its interoperability. Monique also spoke to opportunities for the Council to work with the conservation community as well as ways for the conservation community to support the Council. She also offered to assist in developing and holding a workshop, summit or symposium for states to discuss and share cross-jurisdictional data needs and how to consider and use NGO derived data. The PowerPoint she presented was requested by the Council members and will be distributed by WGA.

#### Carl Sylvester and Chris Friel, ESRI

Carl and Chris spoke to DSS trends and best practices as well as the use of GIS for crucial habitat mapping. ESRI has sight licenses with DOI and USDA and other major agencies so federal agencies mostly use or have access to ESRI technologies. Most states also have purchase agreements with ESRI to obtain reduced price software. ESRI's power point was requested by the Council and will be distributed by WGA.

#### Keith Aune, Wildlife Conservation Society

WCS is holding a Best Sciences Workshop the week of March 30April 1 and 2, and WGA is on the agenda to speak to the policy context for using scientific data on wildlife corridors. The National Park Service is also doing conducting a series of workshops on connectivity and corridors that the Council should be aware of. WCS has developed a goal vs. tool matrix as well as a sample scorecard that could assist in DSS development and evaluation.

#### Bruce Beard, Department of Defense

The Council was joined by telephone by representatives of the Department of Defense to discuss their work mapping wildlife corridors and crucial habitat as part of DOD's



Western Regional Partnership (WRP) program. The WRP has a Committee working on a number of pilot projects to map wildlife corridors on DOD lands in some of the southwestern states. DOD participated in the initial Wildlife Corridors Initiative report and is very interested in partnering with the Council to share wildlife data and use information from the DSSs in planning projects.

### **Agenda Items: Opportunities for 2009: Federal and Congressional Strategy Tasks and Funding**

On April 7 John Harja will testify on behalf of WGA before a field hearing of the House Natural Resources Subcommittee on National Parks, Forests and Public Lands nearby Joshua Tree National Park in southern California. The topic of the hearing is the impact of climate change on National Parks. WGA is preparing testimony on the corridors report, its climate change recommendations and the work of the Council. Any issues for the testimony should be submitted to WGA before April 3.

In March Joanna Prukop testified before the Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources regarding energy development on public lands and endorsed the work of the WGA on WREZ and wildlife corridors. She also worked with WGA to respond to a Senate Energy Committee request for legislative language that would authorize funding for DSS development in western states and coordination of those developments among states and with the federal agencies.

Holly Michael is working with AFWA in DC and she asked for a copy of the Senate Energy proposal to use as a resource during her visit April 6. WGA will circulate that proposal to all and Council members. This document will serve as the basis of the request to the three Secretaries potentially at the WGA Annual Meeting this June. It was agreed that the concept in the proposal should serve as a basis for talking points for all Council members during DC visits.

Keith Aune, Wildlife Conservation Society, volunteered to activate a DC working group of the conservation community to support requests of the legislature or the federal government made by the Council.

WGA anticipates receiving requests from Congress on a semi-regular basis, so in order to streamline the process the Council agreed to work by conference call or e-mail to assist WGA in responding to Congressional requests or review proposed legislation relating to wildlife corridors and the work of the Council. Should timing of the request not allow WGA to solicit full Council consideration, the Council agreed that the Chair and Vice-Chair could provide input on the Council's behalf. This process does not preclude individual Council members from speaking to Congress about Council policies and activities on their own behalf.

It was agreed that WGA should develop a list, with web links, of pending wildlife legislation in the Congress and circulate that information to the Council.

**Public Comment – Day 2**

Public comment was taken throughout the morning's discussion and no extra time for public comment was requested by attendees.

**Wrap-Up**

After a recap of key action items outlined at the top of the minutes, the Council adjourned.

*Attachment A: Meeting Participants*

**WGWC Members**

Utah - Chair

John Harja, Director  
Public Lands Policy Coordination Office  
Office of the Governor

Arizona – Vice Chair

Bob Broscheid, Assistant Director  
Wildlife Management Division

Colorado

Tom Remington, Director  
Colorado Division of Wildlife

Montana

T.O. Smith  
Special Projects, Planning and Policy Coordinator  
Montana Dept of Fish, Wildlife & Parks

New Mexico

Bruce Thompson, Conservation Initiatives Coordinator  
New Mexico Energy, Minerals and Natural Resources Dept.

Oklahoma

J.D. Strong  
Oklahoma Secretary of the Environment

Oregon

Holly Michael  
Conservation Strategy Leader, Office of the Director  
Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife

Washington

John Mankowski, Policy Advisor, Natural Resources  
Governor's Office

Wyoming

John Emmerich, Director  
Wyoming Game and Fish Department

**Observers**

Keith Aune, Wildlife Conservation Society  
Steve Belinda, TRCP  
Monique DiGiorgio, Western Environmental Law Center

Jackie Fehr, Wildlife Protection Society  
Chris Friel, ESRI  
Julia Kintsch, Eco-Resolutions, LLC  
Brad Powell, Trout Unlimited  
Kirk Robinson, Western Wildlife Conservancy  
Will Singleton, Singleton Strategies  
Carl Sylvester, ESRI

**Staff**

Rich Halvey, WGA  
Pam Inmann, WGA  
Doug Miyamoto, NRCS/WGA  
Paul Orbuch, Orbuch Consulting  
Madeleine West, WGA

*Attachment B: Meeting Agenda*

**Western Governors' Wildlife Council Meeting  
March 26-27, 2009**

**1600 Broadway, 5<sup>th</sup> Floor Conference Room  
Denver, Colorado**

**(Meeting will take place in conference room in WGA's Building)  
WGA Phone Number: 303-623-9378**

Hotel Rooms at The Magnolia Hotel  
818 17th Street, Denver, Colorado  
303-607-9000  
(Five blocks from WGA Office Building)

**Objectives:**

- Review and discuss criteria for a successful Decision Support System;
- Review existing actions by individual states regarding development of a state DSS;
- Review use of wildlife information in the Western Renewable Energy Zones project, and draw from the project regarding development of state DSSs and information management;
- Establish subcommittees (Science Committee and a DSS Task Group) to discuss needs and tasks, for subsequent WGWC review, related to scientific advice and a DSS creation and implementation process;
- Identify specific actions for 2009 consistent with the WGWC work plan; and,
- Identify federal and foundation partnerships and funding opportunities for states and the WGWC.

**Day One: Thursday, March 26**

**12:00 p.m.     Lunch Provided**

**12:30 p.m.     Agenda Review and Introductions**

**12:40 p.m.     WGWC Opening Comments** – John Harja, UT and Bob Broscheid, AZ  
Chair and Vice-chair lead introductions and discussion of objectives for this meeting.

**12:50 p.m.     Decision Support Systems, Requirements and Existing Models**  
The WGWC work plan identifies actions related to the creation of state DSSs, and actions to ensure application of the DSS in relevant decision-making processes, including the development of model Executive Orders or other regulatory mechanisms. WGWC members will consider the nature and scope of a DSS; what are the necessary elements for successful creation and implementation? What regulatory structure might be necessary, along with the GIS database? As part of the discussion, WGWC members should be prepared to discuss examples of work within their state which could be useful for other states to consider. The

discussion may also include engaging governors as advocates for this next phase of the Wildlife Corridors Initiative – including actions at the WGA Annual Meeting.

- 3:00 p.m. WREZ Wildlife Maps** – Patrick Crist, NatureServe  
WGWC will review the map categorizations on a regional scale, and review how states individually categorized their datasets. NatureServe will present how wildlife data intersected with WREZ Qualified Resource Areas. WGWC members will review issues identified by their state task group members. NatureServe will give their observations of issues that should be addressed as the states work to create coordinated DSSs.
- 3:30 p.m. WREZ Environment and Lands Co-chairs Discuss REZ Recommendations** – Carl Zichella, Sierra Club and Brian Weber, MidAmerican Energy Holdings Company  
The Environment & Lands Work Group is responsible for making a recommendation to the WREZ Technical Committee on wildlife categorizations used to help determine REZs. The E&L decision-making process and recommendations will be presented. Opportunities for inputs into WREZ Phases 2-4 on transmission, as per the WGWC workplan, will be discussed.
- 4:45 p.m. Public Comment and Discussion**  
Comments from interested observers at the meeting will be invited and can be discussed by the WGWC.
- 5:00 p.m. Concluding Discussion, Observations and Review Day Two Agenda**
- 6:00 p.m. Dinner downtown – Katie Mullen’s, 1550 Court Place**

**Day Two, Friday March 27:**

- 7:30 a.m. Breakfast Provided**
- 8:00 a.m. Welcome and Review of Goals**
- 8:10 a.m. Consideration of Subcommittees (Science Committee & DSS Task Group)**  
WGWC will consider establishing subcommittees to further discussion concerning scientific advice and the process for creating DSSs. The charge to each group will be discussed, including recommendations to the WGWC for further study. Additionally, membership and timeframes will be discussed, and suggestions for outside assistance will be considered.
- 9:30 a.m. Break**

- 9:45 a.m. Opportunities & Interested Partners**  
Keith Aune, Wildlife Conservation Society  
Monique DiGiorgio, Western Environmental Law Center  
Carl Sylvester and Chris Freil, ESRI
- 10:30 a.m. Opportunities for 2009: Federal and Congressional Strategy Tasks**  
WGWC members will be asked to brainstorm specific opportunities for federal cooperation and congressional action. Examples include:
- Partnerships with Federal Agencies and NGOs (tax incentives for conservation, 1% for wildlife language, etc.)
  - Engaging on legislation relating to wildlife and climate change adaptation
- 11:15 a.m. Funding: Providing the States with Resources and Coordination**  
WGWC will identify steps to re-initiate partnership discussions with foundations, the federal government and others. A strategy to pursue funding opportunities will be discussed.
- 12:00 p.m. Public Comment and Discussion**  
Comments from interested observers at the meeting will be invited and can be discussed by the WGWC.
- 12:15 p.m. Wrap-Up & Next Steps**  
WGA staff will summarize their next steps, calendar a next meeting and identify objectives. Next meeting could coordinate with WAFWA Summer Meeting, July 10 – 16, Newport Beach, CA.
- 12:30 p.m. Adjourn**